

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO "McD," ROBERT F. McDERMOTT, ON HIS RETIREMENT AS CEO OF USAA

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a man known throughout the San Antonio area simply as "McD." McD is Robert F. McDermott, one of the most public-spirited and patriotic Americans I have ever known. After a half-century of remarkable accomplishments as a military and corporate and civic leader, General McDermott stepped down as head of USAA, our 21st largest diversified financial services company, on September 1, 1993. On October 6, San Antonio will honor McD at an event titled: "Celebrating 25 Years of Vision in San Antonio: 25 Years of McD."

Who and what is this man so many have come to love and revere? His biography gives clues but perhaps not the complete answer. The son of a musician, he attended the renowned Boston Latin School. An accomplished musician himself—he even played his trombone here in Washington with a visiting band in the late 1930s—he also was captivated by flight, inspired by Lindbergh, and the military. He entered West Point, graduated in 1943 and flew P-38 fighters in 61 missions over Europe.

During those war years, he met and married another McDermott, Alice, a Connecticut teacher but no relation. They were to have three sons and two daughters and then 13 grandchildren. The love of McD's life, Alice died in 1990 but remains his hero.

After a West Point faculty tour, McD later became the new Air Force Academy's first dean and, at 39, the youngest military flag rank officer at the time in 1959. He has been called the "Father of the Air Force Academy" for the innovations he brought to the academy, many later adopted by the sister service academies.

With five children to educate, McD retired from the Air Force in 1968 to join USAA, then a small auto insurer for military officers. Declining more lucrative offers, he saw USAA as an unique opportunity for service. McD transformed a small company with \$207 million in assets owned and managed into a financial services giant with more than \$31 billion. It was a remarkable 25 years.

Concurrently, McD, retaining his unmistakable Boston accent, consciously metamorphosed into a San Antonian and Texan. His civic accomplishments, focusing on doing things for people, boggles the mind, particularly when added to the enormous expansion and diversification he masterminded at USAA. Initiatives aimed at health, education, bricks and mortar and, above all, children, are only some of the elements of his remarkable leg-

acy. He did it by applying the inimitable McD vision, zeal and persuasiveness. He already has been honored many times over—even a section of Interstate 10 that runs by USAA headquarters now bears his name.

But his extraordinary 50-year career only suggests what really motivates McD. The essence lies perhaps in his own words, as he addressed a USAA management meeting on July 22, 1993 when he announced that he was stepping down as CEO. In his reflections, he identified his compass. It was not "bigger and better" for the sake of bigger and better. Rather, it was a moral lesson he learned in Sunday School. As he put it: " * * * we learned that Christ, during his time, had summed up the Ten Commandments in a positive way, instead of 'Thou shall not * * *,' which most of the commandments started with. He said there are two commandments and, stating them in a positive way, he said, 'Thou shall love thy God, and thou shall love thy neighbor as thy self.' For years after that, I tried to probe the deeper meaning of those two simple commandments and what it would mean to me in my life."

That McD has lived the "Golden Rule" is indisputable. And he has already reaped rewards of that unusual commitment. As he told USAA executives: " * * * my psychic income is the highest of anybody in San Antonio or in the insurance industry."

What then is McD? He is many things, among them citizen, soldier, pilot, musician, father, grandfather, teacher, leader, innovator, and patriot. But to me he is what I would call simply a 20th century renaissance man, that rare individual, a model for us all.

He will continue giving of his talents as he steps down from USAA's helm. Who knows what the years to come will bring from this wonderful man? It has been a privilege to know him and work with him. We are all the better for his good works.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF J. SNIZEK

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to pay tribute to a distinguished civil servant from South Amherst, OH. Chief Thomas J. Snizek, who is retiring at the end of September, he has served his community for nearly a half century. It is an honor to have someone of his caliber in Lorain County.

In 1946, Mr. Snizek began his service as a special deputy marshal with the South Amherst department. Only 3 years later he was promoted to the status of deputy marshal, and it was from this position that he rose to the honor of police chief in 1953.

Chief Snizek is a member of both the American and the Ohio Police Hall of Fame. In the

American Hall of Fame he has the additional distinction of holding the Medal of Honor. Chief Snizek is also an honorary police officer in Reims, France.

Chief Snizek has been an invaluable asset to the South Amherst police department. His keen sense of public service has been a hallmark of his 47 years in law enforcement, and 40 years as the department's police chief.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask you and my fellow Members of Congress to join me in recognizing Chief Snizek for his many years of service to the South Amherst police department. I am proud to represent Chief Snizek in Congress, and it is a privilege for me to honor him in this small way as his remarkable career in law enforcement comes to a close.

SCARE TALK ABOUT NAFTA

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to read the following editorial by Robert J. Samuelson exposing the alarmist scare-tactics currently being used to drum up unfounded opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement. I hope that this will be helpful in unclouding the debate about NAFTA.

SCARE TALK ABOUT NAFTA

On NAFTA, Jay Leno got it about right. NAFTA is shorthand for the North American Free Trade Agreement—a free trade pact between the United States and Mexico. Last week, Leno wandered out of his studio to ask people on the street what they think of it. Think of it? Hey, they have hardly heard of it. A typical response went: "Nafta? How do you spell that?" As Leno discovered, Americans aren't lying awake worrying about NAFTA.

All of which makes the strident opposition of so many congressional Democrats mystifying. They're not only against it. They're determined to defeat it and humiliate President Clinton, who backs the agreement. Hello, anybody home? Yes, George Bush originally negotiated NAFTA, but he's gone to Texas; this guy Clinton is your president. The opposition is all the more perplexing, because the case against NAFTA is so weak.

What we're being told is that free trade with Mexico would devastate the U.S. economy. With its low wages, Mexico would unleash a flood of cheap imports into our markets. There would be a mass exodus of U.S. factory jobs, as hordes of American companies fled across the border. "Save Your Job, Save Our Country: Why NAFTA Must Be Stopped—Now" is the book by Ross Perot and Pat Choate that captures the worst fears. Many unions make similar arguments.

All this is scare talk. To understand why, you need to grasp NAFTA's basics. They boil down to three propositions.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

(1) Contrary to anti-NAFTA rhetoric, the trade agreement would probably boost U.S. jobs. But the impact on jobs—whether good or bad—would be small.

The idea that Mexico will hijack our industrial base is a myth. "If this fear were realistic, it would already have happened," as economist Gary Hufbauer of the Institute for International Economics puts it. Mexico's wages have long been lower than ours, and most of its exports already enter our market without any tariff. (The average tariff; 1.9 percent.) If companies were going to flee, they would have done so years ago. They haven't fled for lots of reasons: American workers are more productive than Mexican workers; Mexico's transportation and communications systems are less efficient; U.S. companies need to be close to U.S. customers.

Our economy is 20 times the size of Mexico's. Mexico simply isn't capable of flooding us with cheap goods. Nor can it absorb enough of our exports to generate dramatic U.S. job increases. Still, most of the import barriers that would come down under NAFTA would be Mexico's against our products. Its tariffs average about 10 percent. This is one reason most experts think NAFTA initially would raise U.S. exports and jobs. Recent experience is encouraging. Since the mid-1980s, Mexico has unilaterally cut its steep tariffs and quotas. Annual U.S. exports soared from \$12 billion to \$41 billion between 1986 and 1992. A \$5 billion trade deficit became a \$5 billion trade surplus.

(2) NAFTA is an exercise in enlightened foreign policy—an effort to make Mexico richer and thereby, a better neighbor.

Both Presidents Bush and Clinton have bought the promise of NAFTA, which is the brainchild of Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari. For Salinas, NAFTA represents a way to consolidate radical changes in Mexico's economic policies. He has tried to dismantle elaborate economic controls. Many state-owned companies have been sold. Tariff reductions have been dramatic. The goal is to spur economic growth by creating a climate that attracts investment and opens Mexico to global competition.

So far, Salinas has enjoyed modest success. Since 1989 Mexico has lured about \$42 billion in new foreign investment. Meanwhile, its economy has grown consistently for six years, a contrast with the stagnation of the early 1980s. NAFTA would make Mexico's low tariffs and relaxed restrictions on foreign investment harder to undo by encasing them in a treaty. Salinas's economic policies have also had a political edge. Trying to cooperate with the United States, he has abandoned anti-American rhetoric.

(3) If NAFTA works, huge gains for the United States would emerge gradually over 10 or 15 years.

A prosperous, stable and democratic Mexico would simply be a better neighbor than a poor, unstable and undemocratic Mexico. Higher economic growth would ultimately reduce illegal immigration into the United States. Mexicans could stay home and get jobs. It would be easier to cooperate with Mexico on issues ranging from the environment to drug traffic. Finally, a more prosperous Mexico would help some mature U.S. industries. Autos are a good example. Mexico has about eight cars per 100 people; we have about 57 per 100. A richer Mexico would buy more cars, and many of these would be designed and built in the United States.

The obsession with jobs obscures what NAFTA is really about: the remaking of Mexico. Some U.S. industries would lose

under NAFTA; others would gain. But the potential losses are tiny compared with job disruptions that are caused by business cycles or new technologies. The real cloud over NAFTA is that it may not remake Mexico, as Mexican political scientist Jorge Castaneda argues in "Foreign Affairs." Mexico might not attract ample foreign investment. Joblessness might rise, because inefficient Mexican firms can't withstand foreign competition. Salinas's modest political reforms, designed to end one-party rule, might stall. Corruption, as Castaneda notes, remains widespread.

But NAFTA is the gamble that Mexico's leaders have made, and no one has advanced a better idea. The question for Americans is whether the alternative—conducting U.S.-Mexican relations without the agreement—is good policy. It isn't. Defeating NAFTA might stunt Mexico's economic development. It would also represent an enormous setback to U.S.-Mexican relations, because Mexico's leaders have staked so much on NAFTA.

The alarmism about jobs is actually an assault on the president's authority to make foreign policy. The economic logic against NAFTA is weak as is the political logic. Congressional opposition is a wrecking operation. It has little popular appeal. Jay Leno knows this, but do congressional Democrats?

RURAL HEALTH CARE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 15, 1993, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RURAL HEALTH CARE

President Clinton is expected to unveil his health care reform package sometime this fall. I will be particularly interested to see how the President's plan will affect rural communities in Indiana and around the country. Rural community leaders have struggled to maintain health services that are badly needed by local residents and critical to long-term economic development. Businesses are reluctant to locate to communities without physicians and a nearby hospital. Keeping health services available in rural America, however, is proving to be increasingly difficult. Young physicians are choosing urban practices in increasing numbers and are declining opportunities to practice the primary care specialties most needed in rural areas: family medicine, internal medicine and pediatrics.

ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE

Rural America suffers from limited access to medical care. Small rural communities in this country have only about half as many physicians per capita as larger ones. Two thirds of all of the country's rural counties either have no physician or are so short of a sufficient number that they are classified as Health Professions Shortage Areas (HPSAs). Likewise, during the 1980's 10% of the nation's rural hospitals closed their doors and the closures are continuing unabated during the present decade. Hospitals with less than 100 beds and low occupancy rates have been particularly vulnerable.

Exacerbating the problem is the fact that rural populations generally are older and poorer than their urban counterparts. They

are 25% more likely to report that they suffer from a chronic disease than the rest of the population. Rural people need more access to health care but, at present, they are less likely to get it.

EXPERIENCE IN INDIANA

Eleven of the Indiana counties of the 9th District are classified as HPSAs, in whole or in part: Franklin, Ohio, Switzerland, Jennings, Scott, Brown, Crawford, Spencer, the central part of Ripley, the southwest part of Washington, and the southeast portion of Harrison. When the Indiana State Department of Health surveyed rural residents in 1991 about their views on health care in their communities, 21% expressed concern about the shortage of physicians. Securing physicians for such communities can be very difficult. Professional recruiters often charge \$20,000, or more, with no guarantee of success.

Indiana rural hospitals have fared much better than those of the nation as a whole. Close to 200 rural hospitals have shut down nationwide over the past five years, but only one of these was in Indiana (the George Ade Hospital in Brook). Prudent Hoosier hospital management and strong support for local hospitals have kept our rural hospitals open so far, but most rural hospitals in Indiana continue to face a difficult financial situation.

FEDERAL EFFORTS

During the past ten years Congress has approved a number of initiatives to help rural communities secure physicians and keep rural hospitals open. The National Health Service Corps, which assigns physicians and other health professionals to HPSAs in return for a free medical education, has been revitalized. 13 of these physicians now serve in Indiana. Medicare payments to primary care physicians, the bulk of those serving rural areas, have been increased at the expense of payments to specialists. Additional 10% Medicare bonuses are paid to physicians who serve HPSAs.

In addition, many reimbursement increases to rural hospitals under Medicare have been made. While payments to urban hospitals are still higher for the same procedure, the differences have been greatly narrowed. Higher payments also are made to several special categories of rural hospitals, including large rural referral centers, small hospitals that serve isolated rural towns, hospitals that use some of their beds for nursing care some of the time, and hospitals that serve a particularly high percentage of Medicare patients. Over half of the nation's rural hospitals now have received financial assistance under a federal Transition Grant program that helps hospitals and the communities they serve adjust the service mix of the hospital to better serve local needs. I supported these programs, and others like them, and will continue to press for improvements in rural health care.

STATE EFFORTS

Many states play important roles in improving access to health services in rural areas. Some pay higher rates to rural physicians (Kentucky) or rural hospitals (Oregon) under their Medicaid programs, which provide health services to the poor. Some establish and operate clinics in rural areas (North Carolina) or set up medical practices and recruit physicians (Wisconsin). The University of Minnesota sends many third year medical students out to rural medical practices to understand family physicians for nine to twelve months. These students go on to primary care careers in rural Minnesota in most cases.

PRIVATE INITIATIVES

Governments can help solve this problem, but they can not do it alone. For example, unless local citizens have enough confidence in their local physicians and hospitals to use them, instead of driving to the city for health care, they are likely to lose them. Health providers play an important role as well. Rural hospitals that form consortiums to benefit from economies of scale are more likely to survive. So are those which are innovative in finding expertise in management. Sometimes this means hiring a health care management company to manage the hospital—as the Perry and Jennings county hospitals have done.

CONCLUSION

We are in a period in Washington in which most health care issues have been placed on hold, pending introduction of the President's health care reform proposal. The White House health care reform task forces paid considerable attention to rural issues and I am quite hopeful that the proposal President Clinton will introduce later this month will help extend services to rural areas. When the proposal is submitted, I will seek the consultation of physicians, other health care professionals and users of health care to help determine its merits. The nation's governors are very concerned that health care reform allow considerable flexibility to the states so that a state like Hawaii that already guarantees health care to most residents will not have to start all over again. I believe that state experiments to make affordable health care available should be encouraged and agree with the need for flexibility in national health care reform, particularly to meet rural needs.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY GREGORY, FIREFIGHTER

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated firefighter, Larry Gregory, as he prepares to retire from public service. His commitment to the safety of his neighbors in Sterling Heights, MI, deserves recognition and praise.

Almost 25 years ago, in September 1969, Mr. Gregory was hired by the Sterling Heights Fire Department. He was reinstated in February 1981 and continued his service as acting sergeant from 1986 until 1988.

Mr. Gregory has always gone beyond the call of duty to reach out to the community. He participated in the Fire Department Explorers Program throughout the 1980's as a counselor. He also assisted with Fire Department Open Houses and Community Service Day Programs.

Mr. Gregory will retire on November 10 of this year to enjoy his retirement with his wife, Catherine, and four sons. I extend my wishes for a healthy and happy retirement.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

YELTSIN MOVES TO END CHAOS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Boris Yeltsin cut the Gordian knot that has paralyzed Russian politics for over a year: he suspended the constitution, disbanded the Russian parliament, and called for new parliamentary elections in December. Technically speaking, this act was illegal, as Yeltsin himself acknowledged. But he forcefully made the argument that he acted in the spirit of democracy by breaking the letter of the law.

Last April, large majorities of voters in Russia voiced their support of President Yeltsin and his policies, while calling overwhelmingly for new parliamentary elections. Basing his mandate on that referendum, as well as his June 1991 victory as Russia's first ever democratically elected president, Yeltsin has moved to realize the will of Russia's electorate.

President Clinton and the leaders of the Western democracies have backed Yeltsin's action, recognizing that the situation in Russia is extraordinary, historic and worrisome. The overwhelming power of an unrestrained executive branch, and the absence of popular representation and checks and balances, have been the cause of many of Russia's misfortunes over the centuries. So under other, ordinary circumstances, the West, and especially this body, the United States Congress, would applaud the assertiveness shown by the Russian Congress of People's Deputies in its ongoing struggle with President Boris Yeltsin—a strong personality who sometimes behaves erratically.

But the primary reason for continued Western backing for Yeltsin is our perception of the divergent goals pursued by the contending branches of power. Yeltsin is explicitly pro-American, pro-Western, pro-market, and has pursued a relatively restrained policy toward the other former Soviet Republics. There are grounds for concern about implementation of these policies, but compared to what we could expect from the Russian Parliament, Yeltsin's objectives are more promising of democratic and economic reforms being implemented and succeeding. The Parliament has accused the West of seeking to undermine and weaken Russia. It urges a much more hardline approach to the other former republics. As for economic reform, the Parliament opposes Yeltsin's privatization program, and largely reflects the views of the Communist Party nomenklatura and managers of large industrial enterprises and collective farms. Moreover, the Russian Parliament—while not uniformly reactionary or pro-Communist, as is often claimed—nevertheless represents the political realities of 1990, before the lifting of the Communist Party's monopoly. Its members do not have the obvious legitimacy Yeltsin enjoys, they do not reflect the political realities of today's Russia, and under the current leadership, the Parliament has done everything in its power to undercut Yeltsin and his programs.

The result has been what a Washington Post article last Saturday aptly called "irrelevant chaos." But Mr. Speaker, Russia—with

its thousands of nuclear warheads and pivotal position in world politics—cannot afford "irrelevant chaos," and neither can the United States afford such conditions in Russia. It is imperative for the people of Russia, and for our own interests, that a democratically elected government implement necessary reforms and keep Russia on a pro-Western track. Boris Yeltsin's courageous and admittedly risky move yesterday, we hope, will lead to precisely that outcome.

New parliamentary elections are now scheduled for December 12. Members of the current parliament should be allowed to run for office. If they win, we should honor their victory as an expression of the democratic process—and President Yeltsin will have to, as well. Meanwhile, we look forward to that vote, and are wishing success to the people of Russia.

TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST EVANGELICAL CHURCH OF LORAIN, OH

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize the achievements of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lorain, OH. During the month of September 1993, this remarkable church will celebrate over 90 years of service to the community.

Established in 1899, the First Evangelical Lutheran Church was originally a mission church with services in both German and English. In 1903 the mission was reorganized, and a constitution and by-laws were adopted.

Following reorganization, the present church property was purchased along with an old schoolhouse which was moved to the property and used as the place of worship. In 1924 the present church was erected, with only a slight setback when it was struck by a tornado during construction.

The First Evangelical Lutheran Church has been a bedrock of fortitude and support for the community since its inception in 1899. Through programs such as the Senior Taxi Service, and Meals on Wheels, this church has worked to improve the lives of many people. In addition, the church has taken part in the sponsorship of a refugee family from Laos, and the regular donation of food to the area's needy families.

During this month of September 1993, the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lorain has paused to honor and praise the deep and abiding Christian commitment of its many past and present members. Over the years this church has been blessed with members who have given unselfishly to provide valuable human services where the need continues to be so great.

Two individuals who exemplify the generous giving that First Evangelical Lutheran Church has become known for are the Rev. Linwood H. Chamberlain, Jr., and the Rev. Jimmy W. Madsen. Their efforts have done much to enhance the cultural, spiritual, and educational development of Lorain area residents.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask you and my fellow Members of Congress to

join me in recognizing the First Evangelical Lutheran Church to join me in recognizing the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lorain and its many members. As they celebrate their 90-year anniversary, let us remember the church's true commitment to enhancing the dignity and nurturing the spirit of all people.

WE CAN LEARN FROM EXCHANGE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most effective ways for the United States to help Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States make the difficult transition to democracy and capitalism is to establish direct and personal relationships between Americans and the people of Russia, Ukraine, and the other Republics.

This summer, residents of the Sixth District of Georgia hosted some 100 Russians in their homes to show them what freedom and life in America is all about. I urge my colleagues to read the following article about what we can learn from this exchange and to support the efforts of organizations like Freedom Exchange which are dedicated to bringing people to the most dynamic Nation on Earth and encouraging them to take freedom, democracy, and free markets back with them in the effort to establish a more united, peaceful world.

[From the Gwinnett Post-Tribune, Aug. 18, 1993]

WE CAN LEARN FROM EXCHANGE

This summer some residents of the Sixth District have been involved in an experiment that is an important step toward global peace and prosperity.

This year's pilot program of Freedom Exchange brought 140 young Russian business people and professionals to the United States to show them the basics of freedom and the free enterprise system.

The largest group of these Russian visitors are here in the Sixth District. These 100 young men and women are working side by side with American business people to learn the basics of capitalism: how to attract customers, advertising, marketing, and customer service.

Several families and business people have told me that they are learning as much about Russia and Russians as our guests are learning about America. This is a two way program of two people learning about each other.

This is what some of the hosts are saying: "The people in this program seem to be the upcoming movers and shakers in Russia. What they learn here will make some important changes," said Karen Hills of the North Fulton Chamber of Commerce in Roswell.

"We are learning a lot about each other, but at the same time I realize how often we take for granted what we have and how fortunate we are," said Donna Row, an East Cobb real estate agent.

"I see a young group of people who can change the system in Russia. There is hope, but only with assistance from us," said Charlie Bowers, a Roswell businessman.

"We are both learning. I am learning factual things, he (the Russian intern) is learning impressions. The thing that we are learn-

ing the most is that we are not different," said Rosalee Hopkins, owner of Blanco Hopkins & Associates in Norcross.

Just as the Freedom Exchange is a learning experience for both sides, I think there is much we can learn from today's Russia.

Recently, I traveled to Russia and was impressed with the dramatic scale of change I saw. Their flag has changed, the name of their country has changed, all the old rules are gone.

We Americans have to respect and recognize what an enormous human risk the people of Russia are taking, and we have to ask ourselves, if they are this prepared to change their country, how much are we prepared to change our country?

It seems that we are preaching one thing to President Yeltsin and the Russians and practicing another in Washington. In Russia we are saying, "You need less bureaucracy, you need less red tape, you need more incentives, you need more privatization, you need more decentralization, get power out of Moscow back to the local communities, get power away from the bureaucracy back to the marketplace, have the marketplace set prices and set incentives."

Why then, if we say wage and price controls do not work in Russia, do we think they could work to improve health care in the United States?

In Russia we are seeing what happens when a government doesn't control its budget. To keep the Russian currency from collapsing, the government is calling in old rubles and replacing them with new ones. Four years ago the official exchange rate was 18 Russian rubles to an American dollar. This spring the ruble was worth about half a cent and losing value at one percent a day. By the end of this month a ruble—unless it was printed this year—will be worthless.

If the Russian people who have lived for 70 years under Communism can be expected to learn about market incentives, privatization, decentralization, free markets, private property, then why can't we Americans in Baltimore, New York, Detroit, Philadelphia and Atlanta, also be asked to learn? If they can privatize apartments in Moscow, why can't we find a way to privatize public housing in America?

Our government has indicated a real interest in what happens here with Freedom Exchange. They see this as an experiment which if it works, will be expanded dramatically next year to have at least 10,000 Russians visiting across all of America.

These men and women of Russia decided to take time out of their lives to learn more about freedom and more about America. The host families are sharing of their homes, their time and their lives.

These are the types of relationships we must foster if our children and grandchildren are to live in a united, peaceful world.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 22, 1993 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

The Clinton Administration has embarked on an ambitious effort to "reinvent" govern-

ment—overhauling the executive branch to make federal programs work better and cost less. Following the efforts of various states and businesses, the aim is to replace a large bureaucracy and its bloated chains of command with a more entrepreneurial, decentralized government with power and accountability shifted more to workers. The goal is to make government leaner and more customer-oriented, and to help restore public confidence in government. Based upon a National Performance Review headed by Vice President Gore, the Administration's reform effort proposes hundreds of specific recommendations, ranging from eliminating half of federal management jobs to changing the way the government buys computers. President Clinton has made reinventing government one of his top priorities.

MAIN THEMES

The report, which is very tough on government, criticizes the way government hires people, buys things, centralizes decisionmaking, duplicates programs, and uses outdated procedures. It recommends lengthening the federal budget process from one year to two, minimizing congressional restrictions on federal agencies, cutting federal personnel regulations, giving managers more flexibility in hiring and firing, decentralizing decisionmaking, updating procurement procedures, cutting government regulations in half, adopting measurable performance goals for programs, closing unnecessary field offices, consolidating some agencies, and opening up federal monopolies like the Government Printing Office.

The plan would save an estimated \$108 billion over five years, primarily through eliminating some 252,000 federal jobs—12% of the civilian, nonpostal workforce—as well as through procurement reform and upgrading government technology. About half of the recommendations can be implemented by the President by executive action. The rest would need the specific approval of Congress.

POSITIVE FACTORS

Although there have been about a dozen major executive branch reform efforts this century, several factors suggest that this attempt could be more successful. First, the effort to cut back the government bureaucracy is being undertaken by a Democratic President—which means the recommendations have been met with less initial skepticism—and he will be working with a Democratic-controlled Congress. Second, the Gore task force was staffed by those working within government rather than outsiders, and the report has received support from federal employee unions because it aims to free workers to better it aims to free workers to better do their jobs. Third, President Clinton strongly believes in the reinventing government effort. He undertook similar reforms while Governor. Fourth, the report—one of the best government reports I have read—has strong bi-partisan support. Fifth, there is a widespread recognition that in this era of federal belt-tightening, programs must be shown to operate efficiently if they are to survive. Finally, Americans are clearly upset about overall government performance, and the basic themes of this effort resonate well with the public.

CRITICISMS

Yet skeptics argue that there are several problems with the overall reinventing government effort. First, the report focuses on how government agencies can perform their tasks better, rather than asking the more basic question of whether the agencies should still be performing those tasks at all.

Second, much of the reinventing government effort boils down to less oversight of executive branch employees—by reducing management, employee regulations, and congressional oversight. What some see as red tape, others see as political and financial safeguards. A backlash could emerge, for example, if favoritism creeps back into personnel decisions and government purchases, or if newly empowered mid-level employees make decisions costing taxpayers millions of dollars. Third, deep personnel cuts could come from popular departments and agencies. If carried out proportionately, three-fourths of the cuts would come from the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, Treasury (which includes federal law enforcement), Health and Human Services (which handles social security and medicare), and Agriculture. Fourth, some say that the executive branch is not grossly overstaffed. The 3 million federal civilian workforce (including 800,000 postal workers) basically has not grown over the past twenty years. Indeed, it has shrunk from 3.5% of all civilian employment in 1970 to 2.6% in 1990. The real growth in government employment has been at the state and local levels, where jobs have grown from 10 million to 15 million since 1970. Finally, it is difficult to apply the lessons of businesses and the states to the federal government. Some state experiments have not worked well, and the success of large businesses in "reinventing" themselves has been mixed. Moreover, lessons are not easily transferred to the federal government because of its sheer size and lack of competitors, and because its goals are not easily quantifiable and its "customers" often make quite conflicting demands.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

The process of reinventing the federal government will certainly not be easy. Many powerful constituencies would be affected by the changes. Neither politicians nor bureaucrats give up turf easily, and government entities tend to grow inexorably. Serious roadblocks to the major recommendations could arise in Congress, not just because Members might protect constituents or pet programs, but also because of genuine disagreements with the executive branch over program goals and the proper oversight role of Congress.

Yet I believe that the overall direction being recommended by the Administration is correct. We need a government that is smaller and smarter. We must follow the example of corporate America which for years has been "downsizing" and becoming "lean". Although some of the specific proposals will need careful scrutiny, the broad themes—that government should be more innovative, allow its managers to manage, be more responsive to its customers, and give more attention to results—are right on target.

But for recommendations to become reality, it is crucial that President Clinton demonstrate clearly that he is serious about the effort. He must quickly sign executive orders to implement various recommendations that he can carry out himself. He must show that he will put his power and prestige behind pushing other recommendations through Congress. And he must make it clear to all that he is in this for the long haul—frequently updating the American people on what has been accomplished so far and what remains to be done. The reinventing government effort will take many years, and it will take serious, constant presidential leadership. The report is an important first step, but implementation and followthrough will be crucial.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD SITKO, FIREFIGHTER

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Donald Sitko, a devoted husband, father, and firefighter. Firefighters such as Lieutenant Sitko put their lives on the line to protect citizens from danger. They are truly a cornerstone of the community.

This year, Lieutenant Sitko ends a long career with the Sterling Heights Fire Department. He began his public service in 1970, and worked for the safety of the community for 23 years. In 1989, he was promoted to lieutenant, at which post he served until his retirement.

As a firefighter, Lieutenant Sitko risked his life to save the lives of neighbors and friends as well as complete strangers. He extended his help to the entire community through the fire department open houses.

Donald Sitko spent his career ensuring a safe existence for others. As he prepares to retire in the company of his wife Christine, and his daughter Jennifer, I wish him the same security and peace that he has provided for his community.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY STUDY CONFERENCE ELECTIONS

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, as outgoing House chairman of the Environmental and Energy Study Conference, I would like to announce the election this morning of our colleague JAN MEYERS as House chair and TONY BEILENSON as vice chairman of the study conference, to serve for the duration of this Congress.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN was reelected Senate chairman, and Senator JOE LIEBERMAN was elected Senate vice chairman.

The officers were elected by the study conference's executive committee. The committee was elected earlier this week by the full study conference membership.

Those serving on the executive committee from the House are Representatives GARY L. ACKERMAN, ANTHONY C. BEILENSON, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JIM COOPER, PETER A. DEFAZIO, DEAN A. GALLO, PORTER J. GOSS, STEVE GUNDERSON, LARRY LAROCCO, BOB LIVINGSTON, JOE LIEBERMAN, FRANK PALLONE, JR., MEL REYNOLDS, CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, DAN SCHAEFER, GERRY E. STUDDS, MIKE SYNAR, PETER G. TORKILDSEN, BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, and myself.

Those who will serve on the executive committee for the Senate are Senators JOHN H. CHAFEE, CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, PATRICK LEAHY, JOE LIEBERMAN, JOHN MCCAIN, BOB PACKWOOD, and CLAIBORNE PELL.

The study conference is the largest legislative service organization in Congress, with a membership of more than 270 House Members and 89 Senators. The conference pro-

vides us with objective analysis of environmental, energy and natural resources issues and provides forums and briefings for Senators and House Members to discuss these issues with representatives of the administration, the science community, and interest groups. The conference does not take political positions. It was founded in 1975.

The conference is an important resource that helps improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our offices. By pooling modest membership fees to support a staff of 10 specialists, we receive far more information than we would be able to compile in our own offices at the same cost.

I am pleased that the conference's value to Congress is widely recognized. For example, National Journal described the conference's weekly bulletin as "indispensable," and Newsday called the conference's work "invaluable."

I congratulate the new study conference officers and, as an executive committee member, I look forward to assisting them in their efforts.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHNSON'S BOOKSTORE FOR 100 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to Johnson's bookstore, which has been serving the citizens in Springfield, MA. This year, Johnson's is celebrating its 100th birthday. The store was brought into existence in 1893, by Henry R. Johnson and his brother Clifton Johnson. Within a few years Johnson's bookstore evolved into the landmark it is today on 1379 Main Street.

Johnson's is not only a bookstore, it offers much more. The Johnson brothers began by supplying the consumer with bookkeeping equipment and stationery. Today as a result of their hard work and dedication, the store has grown tremendously. When you walk through the front of the store you will find books, office supplies, stationery, greeting cards, framed pictures, leather goods, and toys. Just when you think you have covered all corners of the store, there is yet another section. In the other section of the store, built in 1914, you will find the antique department and the secondhand bookshop. As seen, the store is able to satisfy the needs of any customer who enters.

In addition to the store's quality of merchandise, there are always friendly and knowledgeable sales people to answer any questions you might have. These people are the third and fourth generation of the Johnson family, who are continuing to carry on the legacy of Johnson's.

Mr. Speaker, as an avid reader, I have always appreciated a good bookstore. Libraries and bookstores are places where knowledge is shared and passed on to new readers. At Johnson's, leisurely browsing is always encouraged. I am proud to have this fine bookstore in my hometown and I salute the owners and employees of Johnson's bookstore on 100

years of quality service. I wish them another 100 years of success.

CSCME: A MIDDLE EAST SECURITY FRAMEWORK

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the recent mutual recognition agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization is a historic step forward. Having fundamentally altered the politics of the Middle East, it makes the possibility of a broader security framework a reality. I believe that a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East [CSCME], modeled on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE], could make a significant and constructive contribution to that end. It offers a process by which barriers to trade, travel, and communication can be discussed and removed; in which old hatreds and passions can be channeled into constructive dialogues between states and peoples; and within which regional stability can be established.

In particular, several aspects of the CSCE are directly applicable to the Middle East: first, the built-in follow-up process; second, the CSCE's status as a political, rather than legal, framework; third, consensus decisionmaking; fourth, the broad and interrelated issues it covers; and fifth, its comprehensive membership.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the CSCE—also known as the Helsinki process—is an ongoing, multilateral forum now involving 53 states, including the United States and Canada. The process was born with the signing of the Helsinki Final Act on August 1, 1975. In hindsight, the Helsinki Final Act's three sets of provisions—on military security, economic and environmental cooperation, and human contacts and humanitarian affairs—represent a masterful balance between competing interests and objectives.

The Final Act initiated an ongoing dialogue in a bitterly divided, post-war Europe which had accumulated the largest concentration of armaments in the history of humanity. The follow-up process mandated by the Final Act brought contending blocs to the negotiating table to address the issues which divided them by reviewing implementation and expanding the scope of their cooperation.

Even critics of the CSCE would agree that the political commitments undertaken by the participating states to implement objectives in the areas of military security, economic cooperation and the environment, and human rights and humanitarian concerns and the discussions that revolved around the implementation of those commitments helped spur change in the former Warsaw Pact. And dialogue in the CSCE is not restricted to states; it involves their peoples to a very large degree. Ordinary citizens and nongovernmental organizations took up the moral debate and the notion of accountability and injected them back into the political realm of the CSCE. These aspects of the CSCE—political dialog and public participation—are critical in the Middle East.

The CSCE's rule of consensus is the natural and necessary counterpart to this dialog. Diverse and divided countries must be assured that the issues of critical importance to their national security and, indeed, their very existence, will not be threatened by merely taking part in a discussion. For this reason, the CSCE assures its participants that decisions will not be imposed upon them by a majority vote. Logically, there is a stronger basis for seeking compliance with commitments when they have been freely undertaken. In a process where even the smallest country has an equal vote, no state can refuse to implement a commitment on the grounds it was simply outvoted. For these reasons, a CSCME should also incorporate consensus as the basis for making decisions.

In particular, the 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act that guide relations between States exemplify the careful equilibrium necessary to give participating states a vested interest in the process, despite the barriers which have divided them. While Principle I provides for the sovereign equality of states and Principle VI mandates nonintervention internal affairs, Principle VII requires respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and instilled in citizens the idea that states were accountable to the governed as well as to each other. While Principle IV speaks of the territorial integrity of states, Principle VIII recognizes the right to self-determination of peoples, and Principle I states that borders can be changed peacefully and in accordance with international law.

Even with the tremendous changes that Europe has undergone in the last several years, the wide range of issues covered in the CSCE continues to give every player some stake in the game. The agenda for a CSCME must likewise be shaped to reflect the issues which are of particular concern to the region. But in addition to other questions of special relevance to the Middle East, the original CSCE principles might serve as a useful outline for opening discussions on a CSCME. Based on more than 18 years of experience, I would argue that these principles have proved their worth. These concepts will take on increasing importance as the peoples of the Middle East demand more accountability from their leaders and as states do so from each other.

A Middle East security framework, in which all the states work together to reduce the likelihood of conflict, has resonant and far-reaching appeal. Such a framework need not depend upon an exact convergence of values or an overall balance of power. A Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East can encourage regional security through arms control, verification, confidence-building, and crisis prevention, just as the Helsinki Final Act provides for confidence-building measures in recognition of the integral interrelationship between the political and military aspects of security.

Both the United States and Russia could play an important role in seeing that a CSCME process is initiated because both share interest containing radical Islamic fundamentalism, stemming terrorism, and securing peace and security in the region. Boris Yeltsin's reformist government well understands the benefits of CSCE. The presence of a multilateral forum for discussion provides an outlet for griev-

ances and a framework for conflict resolution. It must also be remembered that currently in the state of Israel are well over half a million Jews from the former Soviet Union. Though they fought for years to leave their homeland, they nevertheless maintain ties with Russia that can now attract and anchor Russian engagement in an ongoing CSCME process.

Of course, there are no guarantees that a CSCME could solve the complex and explosive problems confronting the Middle East. Meetings and documents can change nothing by themselves if the political will of the participating States is in question. But we are now at an historic juncture where long-absent political will may suddenly exist. We have just witnessed an agreement which has made the conditions for a long-term peace better than they have ever been before. In such a climate, a CSCE-type process can bring strength in its persistence, in its relentless determination to foster continued political will among its participating States and, just as important, among their citizens. The United States should be prepared to remain engaged in the process and to sustain what may be a new order in the Middle East.

Once implacable enemies, the PLO and Israel have now set the stage to live side by side in peace. At the White House signing, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin sadly noted that for many the ceremony has come too late. But weary of hate and revenge that have claimed so many lives, Israel and the PLO took a step toward creating a new order in the Middle East. The establishment of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East would provide an opportunity to bring healing and reconciliation to a region badly in need of both.

TRIBUTE TO ELYRIA HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL PROGRAM

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize the achievements of the Elyria High School football program. On September 24, 1993, the school will hold a celebration day to mark 100 years of football at Elyria High School.

Beginning in 1893, as the Crimson and White, the Elyria High School team, now known as the Pioneers, has maintained a rich tradition in football. The many dedicated players, coaches, and fans that have been a part of this program have set the precedence of excellence and commitment that continues today.

Not only has Elyria High continued a football tradition that has fallen from many school curriculums in our country, but they have done it with many notable achievements.

Among the Pioneer's distinguished alumni is Mr. Vic Janowicz. Playing for the Pioneers in 1945-47, Mr. Janowicz went on to become a Heisman Trophy winner. In 1989 the Pioneers achieved another honor when they earned the title of Erie Shore Conference Champs.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask you and my fellow Members of Congress to

join me in recognizing the Elyria High School football program. Through the efforts of many, Elyria High has carried on a remarkable football tradition for the last 100 years. It is my sincere hope that this legacy will continue with yet another impressive performance by the 1993-94 Elyria High team.

THE VETERANS' LONG-TERM CARE ACT OF 1993

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Veterans' Long-Term Care Act of 1993. This legislation will clearly identify a population of veterans for whom the Department of Veterans Affairs must provide essential long-term care services.

The Committee Veterans' Affairs on which I serve as ranking minority member has for the past 2 years been grappling with the urgent need to reform the VA's system of eligibility for health care services. The issue of eligibility reform for veterans' health care has been put on hold until we know what health reform for the Nation will be. There is no reason why the provisions of this bill cannot ultimately become part of a larger eligibility reform measure for veterans. However, this bill will ensure that the long-term care needs of veterans will be met regardless of what is contained in the national health reform package for all Americans. If we don't act now to preserve an essential mission for the VA in the Nation's health system, we run the risk of losing the VA system altogether.

While virtually all of the Nation's 27 million veterans are eligible for care in the VA, due to years of underfunding, the VA is only able to care for about 2.7 million veterans annually, or about 10 percent of the total veteran population. VA's current eligibility criteria for access to health care services have been imposed over the years to help VA contend with its perennially inadequate budget. As a result, the system is a patchwork approach to health care delivery with a series of differing criteria establishing priority to inpatient care and outpatient care. To make matters worse, there are no established criteria for the provision of long-term care. The legislation I am introducing today will specifically address eligibility and priority for long-term care services.

The VA must have a clearly identified long-term care mission. The aging of the veteran population has put demands on the VA system which will not be met by President Clinton's national health plan. In 1990, there were 7 million veterans 65 years or older; by 2000, that number will rise to 9 million. Of these, 1.3 million veterans will be over 85. Health care utilization rises with age and the VA is simply not in a strong position to meet the needs of aging veterans. Put another way, consider the fact that 11 percent of the total U.S. population are over age 65 comprising 24.5 percent of the veteran population.

Currently, aging veterans account for 38 percent of hospital stays, 32 percent of ambulatory care visits, and 80 percent of all nursing

home admissions. Yet according to the Paralyzed Veterans of America in their recent report, Strategy 2000, the VA has accommodated only about 20 percent of the market share—the rest of veterans' long-term care needs have been met through State veterans' homes, community nursing homes utilizing Medicaid, or private payment for care. Of the near \$15 billion a year VA health care budget, VA only spends approximately 10 percent on long-term care programs.

Essentially, this legislation will change that trend and ensure that VA place more emphasis on programs which meet the true needs of the veterans it serves. It does so first, by clearly identifying a long-term care mission for the VA, as well as those veterans mandated to receive long-term care services, and then follows through with a series of measures designed to enhance the provision of these services. Support of this legislation will affirm my colleagues recognition that the veterans of your districts must have access to a comprehensive array of long-term care services specifically designed to meet their needs regardless of what ultimate array of health benefits will be contained in any future health reform bill approved by this body for all Americans. After all is said and done, no one can argue with the point that veterans who have served their country honorably are a cherished population.

The VA has over the years developed an extensive network of nursing homes, domiciliary care, adult day health-care programs, hospital-based home care programs, long-term psychiatry programs and various noninstitutional alternatives for care. Many of VA's long-term care programs have evolved due to the very nature of war-incurred disabilities and the life-long need for health-related services. Not only are the numbers of veterans aging at a rate which doubles that of the rest of the population, but many are aging with the additional burden of permanent and in some cases catastrophic disabilities. Nowhere other than in today's VA facilities is it more apparent that the cost of a strong national defense continues long after the final shots are fired.

The bill I am proposing today has very few PAYGO implications. The bill provides mandatory free long-term care services to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities and very poor and permanently disabled veterans. I must stress that the bill does not seek to deny access to long-term care services to any veterans. Rather, it requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a mechanism for the collection of premiums and copayments to allow access to other veterans based on their ability to pay. The bill is purposely flexible in this regard in that it does not specify the amount of such premiums and copayments. Rather, the bill gives appropriate responsibility to the Secretary to devise a fee schedule which will maximize the provision of services and at the same time help the Government defray the expense. As my colleagues know, long-term care is frequently the most costly of all health-related services. It is my belief that veterans who have the ability to contribute to the cost of their care, if given the choice, would gladly participate in exchange for the kind of insurance this bill provides.

Many have talked about the need for the VA to become more competitive with the private

sector if VA is to survive in the aftermath of implementation of a national health plan. Years of underfunding have eroded VA's ability to provide care in a timely and customer-oriented manner. Many believe that given the choice veterans would gladly opt for service in the private sector. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body is more in tune with the desires of the veterans community than those of us who sit on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. In hearing after hearing, veterans have strongly supported the maintenance of a separate and independent health care system for veterans. One reason frequently cited in arguing for the preservation of VA health care is the agency's ability to provide cost-effective, yet innovative, state-of-the-art long-term care. The VA just doesn't provide enough of it.

The inclusion of a comprehensive long-term care benefit for veterans will help prevent a recurrence of the Canadian experience. When national health reform took place in Canada in 1968, the separate system for Canadian veterans disappeared. No one had the demise of Canadian veterans hospitals in mind, as I am sure my colleagues do not today, it simply was subsumed by the larger national system. What's more, it is unlikely that any national plan would be able to provide the types of costly, specialized services veterans need and deserve without busting the budget. VA has for a long time operated in a cost-controlled environment. VA has a long history of managed care. Inclusion of long-term care benefits provided through VA would not only increase the agency's competitiveness in attracting veterans, it would ensure that the care is provided in a cost-effective manner.

The bill contains a number of funding mechanisms which will help offset the cost of long-term care. In a 1992 GAO report, it was reported that in fiscal year 1990, VA offset through copayments less than one-tenth of 1 percent of its costs to provide nursing home and domiciliary care in VA and community facilities. In comparison, GAO looked at eight State programs that charged for care and the offsets ranged from 4 to 43 percent of operating costs. GAO concluded that if VA had offset similarly, its yearly cost recoveries would have been between \$43 and \$464 million. Yet in fiscal year 1991, about 55 percent of the veterans discharged from VA long-term care were considered unable to pay. Of these, only 17 percent would be automatically eligible for free long-term care services as mandated in the bill. The remaining 38 percent would be subjected to premiums and copayments as required by the bill and established by the Secretary in return for guaranteed access. Such receipts would result in a PAYGO plus and help VA defray the cost of long-term care. However, the success of this bill will depend on the Secretary's ability to balance the amounts of premiums and copayments charged to veterans with the actual costs of care. The program would need to function as a well-administered insurance program augmented by annual appropriations for those highest priority veterans to whom the VA would continue to provide free care as it now does.

Also included in the legislation is an effort to allow VA more flexibility in contracting with non-VA providers, such as community nursing

homes. The bill provides authority for the Secretary to contract for needed long-term care services in the community when VA facilities are geographically inaccessible, lack sufficient capacity, or when it would be more economical to contract for such care. The planning aspects of the bill direct the Secretary when assessing the need for new long-term care facilities, to take into consideration other Government facilities in the area and facilities available in the community so as to avoid duplication of existing long-term care capacity.

Finally, the bill contains an innovative new authority for the VA to establish veterans' continuing care centers. These centers would be established with another Federal agency, a State or private corporation or nonprofit organization and would be collocated with VA medical centers, outpatient clinics, or nursing homes. They would function as an additional level of care between institutionalization and home care. Currently, VA can provide home care, but it limits that care to veterans who live within a certain specified distance from the medical center. Many veterans live too far away from the medical center to qualify and must either give up their independence and enter a nursing home, find an alternative mode of care, or go without care.

The establishment of continuing care centers would allow veterans to get needed health care while still living in a home setting. VA would be authorized to enter into a partnership with an entity which would construct individual, handicap-accessible housing units on VA grounds for use by the veteran, as well as his or her spouse or primary caregiver. What is particularly unique about this arrangement is that the veteran would enter into a rental agreement and lease the unit. In addition, VA would be authorized to establish a primary care team to oversee the health care services provided to the veteran. I believe these centers would become a truly desirable alternative to institutional care by allowing the veteran to maintain his or her independence while still being able to easily access the VA health care system.

This program is targeted to veterans who would otherwise require hospitalization or nursing home placement. The veteran would be provided through the participating entity a package of benefits such as meal service, homemaking services or transportation. Such services would be included in the monthly fee paid by the veteran to the participating entity. The VA would facilitate access to health services for the veteran.

Many veterans are faced with long-term rehabilitation following spinal cord injuries, extensive burns and many other disabilities. Often the veteran is placed in the hospital or nursing home, the most costly forms of care, in order to receive such rehabilitation. Additionally, he or she must face the separation from home and family during a difficult and long-term recovery. Continuing care centers would allow the veteran to live with a loved one or primary caregiver who will share in the responsibility of caring for the veteran and maintains maximal independence of the veteran. It is a win-win situation for the VA in terms of saving money by not having to provide more costly forms of care and also for the veteran. I am particularly interested in VA pur-

suing a contract with HUD so that subsidized housing units of this type could be made affordable to lower income veterans.

This bill offers a comprehensive, yet cost-effective package of long-term care benefits for our Nation's veterans. In this era of health reform, it is essential for Congress to function as guardians of the health care benefits promised to veterans long ago. This bill will preserve that promise. It sends a strong message to the veteran of this Nation that the country will continue to honor its obligation to care for that veteran throughout his or her lifetime. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

SALUTE TO GLORIA IMAGIRE AND WINSTON ASHIZAWA

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Mrs. Gloria Imagire and Mr. Winston Ashizawa for their undivided support and continued leadership. On September 18, 1993, the Asian Community Center will be honoring these two outstanding individuals at the seventh annual fundraiser for the Asian Community Nursing Home.

The Asian Community Nursing Home is guided and supported by the Asian Community Center and has been a successful and valuable caretaker for many senior citizens in Sacramento. Their dedicated staff, volunteers, and supporters have made this organization one of the most respectable nursing homes in the State. This year two individuals have been chosen as exemplary leaders of these successfully run enterprises.

Mrs. Gloria Imagire was a member of the Asian Community Center board of directors from the time of the first planning meeting in the summer of 1971 through 1992. Her tenure on the board saw the development of numerous service projects, including Asian Resources, Asian Pacific Community Counseling, and Health for All. Over the years, she chaired various committees, including the building committee for the nursing home project, which entailed an active role in the review of sites and designs.

Mr. Winston Ashizawa has served on the Asian Community Center board since 1972. In that time, he has been an active member, serving as both a chairman for numerous committees as well as board vice president. His work was instrumental in the establishment of the Asian Community Nursing Home, for which he attended many city council and board of supervisor meetings to testify for the need of such a facility. Mr. Ashizawa was involved in the fundraising, building, equipment purchasing, and design committees for the nursing home project.

Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento community is proud of the commitment from Gloria Imagire and Winston Ashizawa. I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting these outstanding leaders and their tireless dedication to the Asian Community Center and the Asian Community Nursing Home.

RAISING THE THRESHOLD FOR APPRAISALS FROM \$100,000 TO \$250,000 WILL NOT ALLEVIATE THE CREDIT CRUNCH

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress in January, I practiced real estate and land use law. As a result, I had the opportunity to work frequently and closely with licensed real estate appraisers, and came to appreciate the importance of the work of real estate appraisers in the real estate purchase and lending process. The proposal by Federal bank regulators to raise the mandatory appraisal threshold from \$100,000 to \$250,000 will eliminate appraisals for most residential real estate transactions, endanger consumers and taxpayers, and will not alleviate the credit crunch. I urge the regulators to reconsider this proposal in favor of the program put forth by the Appraisal Institute.

I, therefore, commend to Federal bank regulators, and my colleagues, the following article by Bernard J. Fountain, MAI, SRA, the president of the Appraisal Institute. The Appraisal Institute is a professional organization that represents approximately 32,000 appraisers and appraiser candidates nationwide, and which advances appraisal reform.

THEY'RE AT IT AGAIN

(By Bernard J. Fountain)

Taxpayers beware. Here we go again. No one ever said that cleaning up after the savings and loan mess would be easy. But one might have assumed that Federal agencies charged with regulating the nation's banks and thrifts would not so soon repeat past mistakes.

Yet, banking regulators, with the blessing of the Clinton administration, have mistakenly concluded that the need for professional, independent appraisal of residential property values somehow conflicts with the need to streamline burdensome banking regulations. In their misguided effort to provide relief to America's financial institutions, these regulators propose to remove upwards of 90 percent of home mortgage transactions from the scrutiny of a state licensed or certified appraiser.

Who then would be responsible for determining the fair market value of most residential property? The answer could easily be someone within the very bank or thrift that is doing the lending, a situation that all but invites fraud and abuse.

Before I detail the pitfalls of this foolhardy scenario, some history is in order.

Under the banner of regulatory reform, the Reagan administration eased many restrictions on banks and S&Ls.

In this deregulatory atmosphere, many lenders regarded an appraisal as a mere formality, necessary but meaningless paperwork or a rubber stamp, not a vital safeguard against making unsound loans. Faulty appraisals were performed on some property by untrained, inexperienced people who overinflated real estate values. Some appraisers were more responsive to the banks that hired them than to a code of professional ethics. Later overvalued properties on the books of banks and thrifts caused serious losses when defaults occurred, and the financial institutions could only recoup a fraction of the loan amount.

The combination of loose regulation and no uniform standards for appraisal professionals was part of the recipe for economic disaster.

A House subcommittee reported in 1985 "that appraisal abuses and deficiencies have, in varying degrees, contributed to hundreds of millions of dollars in losses, hundreds of weakened and/or failed institutions and hundreds of enforcement actions." Between 1981 and 1984, House investigators discovered that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—those quasi-governmental agencies that invest in home mortgages—experienced "significant appraisal problems and associated losses." In just one nine-month period, for example, Freddie Mac forced 70 participating lenders to repurchase more than 300 mortgages for unacceptable, inadequate, or missing appraisals—at an estimated cost of \$15.2 million. And when Fannie Mae sold 4,307 properties acquired through default, the aggregate sales price was \$63.2 million less than their original appraised value.

To remedy this deteriorating situation, Congress enacted appraisal reform legislation in 1989, setting up a system to require appraisers to satisfy educational and experience standards. Appraisers currently perform their work subject to state enforcement and industry standards.

The Appraisal Institute, along with consumer groups, mortgage insurers and secondary market investors, fought for these reforms and applauded their enactment. Today we are appalled that federal regulators would undermine reform before it has even had a chance to work.

The purchase of a home is, for most consumers, the most important financial transaction they ever make. Yet the \$250,000 threshold proposed by the regulators denies the benefits of appraisal reform to an estimated nine of every ten homebuyers. It denies them protection from paying a price for their home unjustified by the market. It makes them vulnerable to shady practices by some lending institutions single-mindedly pursuing loan origination fees and other up-front payments regardless of the consequences.

For taxpayers, the \$250,000 threshold threatens to bring back some of the nightmares of the S&L crisis. An Institute for Strategic Development (ISD) study found that small dollar loans backed by faulty appraisals can, in the aggregate, pose significant portfolio risk even to large financial institutions. With virtually all of a bank or thrift's home mortgage portfolio and a large percentage of commercial loans at risk of being improperly appraised, we could see an increase in bank and thrift failures, and even another taxpayer bailout.

For banks and thrifts, this high threshold relieves no burdens and provides no benefits. Use of a licensed and certified appraiser better protects their portfolios.

The Savings & Community Bankers of America, in its comments to the Federal regulators, argued that it would be the institutions most inclined to make risky loans that would take advantage of a lower threshold. "We can envision prominent advertisements proclaiming 'No Appraisals Required! Loans up to \$250,000—No Appraisal Fees.'"

These community bankers know the value of good appraisals and do not want to do anything to weaken their underwriting process.

Unfortunately, other banking groups do not agree. They have argued to Federal regulators that the current appraisal rules are causing needless expenses and needless delays for homebuyers and small business

people because of a shortage of qualified appraisers. However, these arguments are just plain wrong.

The cost of an appraisal is only a very small part of the total fees and costs associated with a real estate transaction. And the current system doesn't increase costs. A survey by the Consumer Federation of America indicates that appraisal costs have not risen. Further, the supply of licensed and certified appraisers is plentiful—the latest count is nearly 80,000 and increasing. In fact, new licensing procedures "should spur an increase in the supply of appraisers, helping to reduce prices," says the Institute for Strategic Development.

The \$250,000 threshold is not regulatory relief; it's regulatory recklessness. Homeowners, taxpayers and responsible financial institutions should join with the Appraisal Institute in demanding a withdrawal of this damaging proposal. If the federal regulators don't regain their senses, Congress should act swiftly to save them from their reckless appeasement of the institutions they are charged with overseeing.

RETAIN THE TRADE EMBARGO TO VIETNAM

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton decided to ease the economic embargo against Vietnam. Myself and 60 other House colleagues addressed a letter dated September 13, 1993, to the President, requesting him not to repeal the embargo.

Given the President's decision, our bipartisan letter was not taken into consideration. The President further eased the trade embargo with Vietnam by allowing American companies to bid for construction and development projects in Vietnam that are financed by the International Monetary Fund and other global lending institutions. Earlier, in July the President refused to attempt to block other nations from paying off Vietnam's \$140 million foreign debt, and with Hanoi's debt paid, Vietnam will be eligible for loans from the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

Despite recent attempts to portray itself as open and cooperative with the United States, Hanoi has been less than forthcoming with information concerning the remains of missing Americans, and often manifests selective cooperation. For instance, there have been 92 individual discrepancy cases where a live American was in Hanoi's hands. Yet, no explanation was provided for these disparities.

The easing of economic sanctions to allow foreign aid and business investment in Vietnam, strips any remaining so-called sanctions to a level of ineffectiveness. Any assistance from the International Monetary Fund would include U.S. tax dollars. I do not believe that most tax payers would be pleased to know their hard-earned money is going to support Hanoi. Easing the trade embargo leaves the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV] with no incentive to provide us with detailed status information on those soldiers Missing in Action [MIA]/Prisoners of War [POW] who were known to have been living but not repatriated

during Operation Homecoming in 1973. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and concomitant aid to Vietnam, the effectiveness of economic sanctions would have increased, thereby providing a greater incentive for Hanoi to be sincere in its interaction with the United States. President Clinton however, succeeded in his desire not to permit an increased effect of economic sanctions toward Hanoi.

Vietnam is a nation riddled and acclaimed for numerous and egregious human rights abuses, and the Clinton administration claims to be a champion of such rights. But when all is said and done, the Clinton administration ultimately displays symbolism over substance. The issue at hand is humanitarian, and economic sanctions are the sole mechanism available to us to force the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to accurately account for all those who served there.

This shameful act by President Clinton flies in the face of all those who valiantly served this great Nation, and the families many of our brave soldiers were never to see again. In 1864, in a letter expressing his grief for the loss of a Union soldier, President Lincoln wrote, "So costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom." In 1993, President Clinton has cheapened the brave service of our soldiers to such an insignificant level, it defies description. Unlike President Lincoln, Bill Clinton could care less about the loss of American servicemen. And unlike the veterans who so rightly demonstrated against the President's attendance at the Vietnam War Memorial, he will not silence the voice of this Congresswoman.

My colleagues, we have a special obligation to our missing servicemen and their families. Those persons who served this great Nation and sacrificed their lives for it are owed a special obligation from us. We must work with Vietnam to bring about their immediate return. However, due to Hanoi's history of displaying uncooperative and even obstructive behavior, the United States must maintain a full economic embargo, so as to ensure future cooperation. To ease economic sanctions in light of the current situation would break faith with those who valiantly served their country and their families, and thereby amount to nothing more than a rank obscenity.

I urge my colleagues who have not joined us in our message to the President, to make their voices known, if not for themselves, then for those we have the duty to represent.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, September 13, 1993.

President WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: We, a coalition of Members of Congress who are concerned about the status of American soldiers who fought during the Vietnam War are requesting that you do not lift the trade embargo to Vietnam on September 14, 1993.

We ask you to consider that there have been ninety-two individual discrepancy cases where a live American was on Hanoi's hands. Yet, Hanoi has not explained what has happened to them. In addition, one-hundred and eight eyewitnesses have asserted that they saw Americans in captivity in Southeast Asia as recently as 1993. Some eyewitnesses have reported that approximately fifty Americans have died while in captivity in

Hanoi, yet their bodies have not been returned to the United States.

A decision to ease trade sanctions against Vietnam will give Hanoi access to loans from multilateral lending institutions. Lifting the trade embargo would leave the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) with no incentive to provide us with detailed status information on those soldiers Missing In Action (MIA)/(Prisoners of War (POW) who were known to have been living but not repatriated during Operation Homecoming in 1973. The issue here is humanitarian and the only mechanism available to us to force the SRV to accurately account for all those who served in Vietnam is through economic sanctions.

Although the SRV has promised to make an effort to determine the fate of those American soldiers who are missing in action, their inability to explain the disposition of the remains, is unsettling. According to the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Edward W. Ross, "At a minimum . . . the Vietnamese have yet to fully account for the remains of the eleven individuals whose photographs from Vietnamese archives have confirmed death."

This indicates that their cooperation is selective and that perhaps the Vietnamese are not prepared to make a good-faith effort to resolve the situation.

In his statement, Mr. Ross indicated that he felt a special obligation to our missing servicemen and their families. We agree that these servicemen are owed a special obligation and that we must work with the SRV to bring about their immediate return. However, because of the SRV's history of uncooperative and even obstructive behavior we believe that the United States must maintain the trade embargo, so as to insure their future cooperation. This economic vehicle is the only way to successfully accomplish our humanitarian goal.

I appreciate the careful consideration and concern that you have shown by not making a quick or hasty decision on this matter. While deliberating over this decision we urge you to also consider and have concern for the millions of American families of Vietnam Veterans who continue to be haunted by the fate of their loved ones.

Susan Molinari, Jerry Solomon, Olympia Snowe, John Linder, Peter Visclosky, Frank Pallone, Floyd Spence, Douglas Applegate, Mike Crapo, Steve Buyer, Herbert C. Klein, Scott Klug, Spencer Bachus, Marge Roukema, Jim Talent, Bill Young, Peter King, Jack Quinn, Rich Baker, Duncan Hunter, Roscoe Bartlett, William Lipinski, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Austin Murphy, Mike Bilirakis, Leslie Byrne, Rick Santorum, Ed Royce, Peter G. Torkildsen, Jim Ramstad, Charles Wilson, Bob Dornan, Thomas W. Ewing, Dana Rohrabacher, Ron Machtley, Corrine Brown, Craig Thomas, John T. Doolittle, Benjamin A. Gilman, E. (Kika) de la Garza, Curt Weldon, Steve Schiff, Jerry Lewis, Jim Traficant, Tom DeLay, Charles T. Canady, Frank R. Wolf, Dean A. Gallo, Bill Goodling, Porter Goss, Mac Collins, Ron Klink, Gene Green, John Duncan, Jim Saxton, Frank McCloskey, Jim Bacchus, John McHugh, Tom Lewis, Dana Rohrabacher.

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK D. PAWLOWSKI ON HIS RETIREMENT AS A FIREFIGHTER

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted public servant, Frederick D. Pawlowski. Mr. Pawlowski's dedicated service as a firefighter in Sterling Heights, MI, merits special notice as he retires.

Mr. Pawlowski leaves behind a legacy of leadership in the Sterling Heights Fire Department. In 1966, he began his career in the former township of Sterling Heights as a "pipeman," as firefighters were then called. He was promoted to sergeant in January 1971, and later to fire inspector in October 1974. From 1984 to 1986, he served as acting fire marshal, and was promoted to fire marshal in 1990.

From June 5, 1990, until his retirement this year, Mr. Pawlowski served tirelessly as the fire marshal of the city of Sterling Heights. At every level of his career, he assisted with the basic training of new firefighters in order to pass on his skills and knowledge. He also coordinated Fire Prevention Week open houses to pass on fire safety practices to the public. His commitment to the safety of the community is recognized and respected by his superiors, his colleagues, and the community.

As Mr. Frederick D. Pawlowski leaves his position as fire marshal to spend more time with his wife, Marge, his six children, and two stepchildren, I extend my sincere wishes for a healthy and happy retirement.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF CAPT. JACK DEAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE TEXAS RANGERS

HON. FRANK TEJEDA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, the Texas Rangers enjoy a long and distinguished history as one of this Nation's most formidable law enforcement agencies. Their heroism and bravery in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds is legendary. Officially established in 1835 to assist a nascent Texas gain independence and protect its frontier, the rangers grew into the States premier police corps. Although rangers no longer ride the open brush country to enforce the laws of an unruly West, they continue their tradition of excellence as an arm of the Texas Department of Public Safety. It is with great honor that I pay tribute today to a modern Texas Ranger, Capt. Jack Dean, who is retiring after serving more than 30 years as a Texas lawman.

Born a year after the 100th anniversary of Texas' independence, Jack Dean has carried on the ranger tradition by devoting his adult life to the protection of the public. Standing more than 6 feet tall, he, like other rangers, continues to carry his saddle with him where

ever he goes. Admired by his colleagues, he has earned the respect of people of diverse backgrounds and interests. Integrity and honor remain his watchwords.

Jack Dean's tenure in law enforcement took him literally to the four corners of the State of Texas. He cut his teeth in the 1960's as a Texas State Trooper, serving in the East Texas city of Tyler and the West Texas town of Pecos. He joined the ranks of the Texas Rangers in 1970 and was stationed in the border city of McAllen. His promotion to sergeant in 1974 took him to Waco in North Central Texas. In 1978, Dean earned his gold captain's badge and relocated to San Antonio, the heart of Central Texas. On September 24, 1993, the Texas Rangers will honor Capt. Jack Dean on his retirement, a bittersweet moment for him and the Texas law enforcement community.

As captain, Dean supervised 15 Texas Rangers in the demanding 39-county region of South Texas, his official duties were equally challenging: the protection of life and property, the suppression of riots and insurrections, the apprehension of fugitives from justice, and the investigation of major crimes and public corruption. Throughout the years, his dedication and skill earned him more than 30 commendations for meritorious performance. In more straightforward terms, Jack Dean saved lives, fought corruption, and defended public safety.

Captain Dean pursued a path of professional growth that serves as an example to all. He has undertaken more than 2,000 hours of training at various institutions, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy's courses on special weapons and terrorism. What he learned, he shared with others as an instructor at the Texas Department of Public Safety Academy and other law enforcement organizations. Dean left his mark on the Texas Department of Public Safety, serving on committees overseeing the department's SWAT teams and revising ranger recordkeeping and statistical reporting. He took an active role in the local community with service on the San Antonio Crime Commission and the San Antonio Police Academy Building Committee.

The Texas Rangers helped shape Texas history, and Capt. Jack Dean continues that great tradition. While the number of cattle rustlers has diminished, the need for excellent law enforcement has not. Jack Dean provided the demanding qualities expected of a Texas Ranger, and his dedication to law enforcement, and to the people he served so well, will not soon be forgotten.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON HONORED ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington [PPMW]. For a quarter of a century, this organization has established a proud

tradition of service in Prince Georges County, MD, which I represent. During the 25 years of service, they have been a strong advocate for and provider of reproductive health care in the county.

From a solid base of volunteer support built in the early years, PPMW's reproductive health, public advocacy, and education programs have grown to serve over 3,000 Prince Georgians in 1993. Today, PPMW is the largest private provider of high-quality, low-cost family planning, gynecological care, and HIV testing in the county.

In 1992, PPMW led the successful campaign to secure voter approval of a Maryland statute safeguarding a woman's right to choose abortion. Prince Georges County volunteers donated countless hours to educating their fellow citizens about the need for access to safe and legal abortion services in Maryland.

Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington works in close collaboration with the department of health, public schools, hospitals, criminal justice system, churches, and community agencies throughout the county. These partnerships enable PPMW to expand its programs and continue to play an important role in the lives of Prince Georges County citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent such a dedicated group of professionals, and I wish them many more years of success and service in Prince Georges County and throughout the metropolitan area.

**WOMEN'S HEALTH INFORMATION
ACT OF 1993**

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Women's Health Information Act of 1993, to improve the dissemination of health information and education to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, a recent General Accounting Office [GAO] study on how well the Federal Government, through the Public Health Service [PHS] and the National Institutes of Health [NIH], is meeting its mandate to develop and to disseminate health information to midlife and older women has revealed that the PHS under DHHS has no overall strategy to identify information needed to ensure that the agencies are communicating vital research results to women and to health care professionals.

It was found that the eight agencies within the PHS and the 14 institutions under NIH are not coordinated in their efforts, have separate goals, budgets, and levels of interest in public information. When it comes to making sure that enough of the health promotion materials are available, no one really knows if they have printed a sufficient number. There does not seem to be a process to eliminate and to estimate how many pamphlets will be needed, how many have been sent out, or how many are still available in inventory. Each does not necessarily know what the others are doing. Therefore, consumers must be motivated, pa-

tient, and persistent in order to make the required number of phone calls to separate agencies to locate information on her desired topic.

In general, the average consumer relies on her health care professional and the media to obtain health information. Because there are so many different agencies and institutes within the Federal Government, the average consumer, who may or may not be well educated, would find it difficult to know where and whom to call for information. This bill improves that role by developing one office that is knowledgeable about which agencies and institutions are conducting specific research and who publishes which brochures about specific health topics.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would establish a coordinated strategy of health promotion and disease prevention activities through the PHS. It would establish a clearinghouse on women's health to compile, archive, and disseminate information concerning women's health and to publish a yearly summary of such materials to be made available upon request. It will establish a toll-free hotline and assess demand for publications and costs on an annual basis, and develop publications as needed.

Finally, the bill will study and evaluate the overall effectiveness of health communications and shall include an analysis of efforts regarding researching underserved population.

It's been proven many times that health promotion can change behavior and prevent disease, disability, and premature institutionalization in later life. But how effectively is information being disseminated to the general public, to health care professionals, and in particular women. The American public wants an efficient and effective use of their tax dollars and they deserve it from every agency in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Women's Health Communications Act of 1993 which will establish a one-stop-shop for health promotion and education.

**TRIBUTE TO BOB WISE OF WEST
VIRGINIA FOR HIS LEADERSHIP
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND
ENERGY STUDY CONFERENCE**

HON. JAN MEYERS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as House chair of the Environmental and Energy Study Conference, I would like to express the conference's gratitude to our colleague from West Virginia, BOB WISE. BOB has just concluded 8 years as an officer of the study conference.

BOB first was elected the study conference's House vice chairman in 1985. He was re-elected to a second term and then was elected House chairman in 1989. BOB was re-elected to that post in 1991.

We have been very fortunate to have BOB guiding the conference over many years. He has approached his leadership role with a dedication to the highest standards in every aspect of the conference's work.

BOB has done an excellent job in recommending ways the conference can most effectively meet the informational needs of Members. That National Journal has described the conference's objective analysis of environment, energy and natural resource issues as indispensable is in no small part a tribute to BOB.

The conference does not take political positions, and BOB has been a careful steward in ensuring the conference's complete independence from any and all outside groups. He has been a forceful spokesman for the conference on the House floor.

The conference has benefited greatly from BOB's quiet good judgment. He has given generously of his time in advising the conference on issues large and small. He has been gracious in dealing with the inevitable but thankless tasks involved in guiding an organization such as this.

BOB has made an invaluable contribution to the development of study conference services for Members. His chairmanship has resulted in an unprecedented level of Member services, which, not surprisingly, has resulted in record memberships and record funding.

BOB has done a superb job as chairman and vice chairman of the study conference. He is regarded with genuine affection by his colleagues and the conference's staff, and we will miss his day-to-day involvement with the conference work.

We are grateful that BOB will continue to serve on the conference's executive committee and we still will have the benefit of his advice.

On behalf of the study conference's members and staff, our thanks to BOB for a job very well done.

**U.S. GRAIN SHIPPERS GOUGE
TAXPAYERS**

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States merchant marine continues to gouge American taxpayers by submitting bids two to four times more rates for shipping United States food aid donations to Russia. Even more egregious is the fact that these greedy benefactors of United States food aid do not have to justify their inflated bids to the American public. Instead, their cargo preference subsidies are paid quietly through U.S. Department of Agriculture accounts.

Fortunately, for those who wish to examine the U.S. merchant marine's indirect pipeline to the U.S. Treasury, the following provisions from the September 16, 1993, Journal of Commerce article are, certainly, worthwhile reading.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Sept. 16, 1993]

ONLY THREE U.S. CARRIERS BID TO HAUL FOOD AID—RATES QUADRUPLE FOREIGN PRICES

(By Stephanie Nall)

WASHINGTON.—After the maritime industry won a high-profile battle this spring for the

right to carry 75% of food aid shipments to Russia, only three U.S.-flag ships have entered the bidding—leaving about 88% of the cargo for foreign-flag ships.

Russia and the U.S. Department of Agriculture last week sought bids to purchase corn and soybean meal and to ship the commodities as part of a much-publicized \$700 million loan aid package granted earlier this year.

Coastal Carriers Corp. submitted bids last week of \$89.95 a ton for two 32,000-ton U.S.-flag container barge units to carry corn from a U.S. Gulf port to the Russian port of Novorossiysk.

That was about four times the rates foreign-flag carriers sought for the same shipments.

But the Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration ruled the rates fair and reasonable after the Department of Agriculture asked for a ruling.

The third bid—submitted by Liberty Shipping Group, Ltd.—was for 48,000 tons at \$49.53 a ton. All three of the U.S.-vessel bids were accepted, but the remainder of the 772,000 tons of corn will be carried on foreign-flag vessels at rates of \$21.95 to \$23.98 a ton.

Another U.S.-flag line submitted three bids ranging from \$99 to \$104 a ton, but withdrew them to accept a bid to carry other government cargo.

Had it not been withdrawn, the USDA would have accepted it as well, an official said.

In June, the Senate passed a non-binding resolution to limit U.S.-flag rates on shipments to Russia to no more than double the world market level.

That resolution was stripped before the appropriations bill was signed into law, but some senators are upset that Marad officials aren't using world competition as a yardstick in determining whether a rate is fair or reasonable.

"These recent U.S.-flag bids of four times the market rate demonstrate two things," Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, said Wednesday.

"It underscores the continued arrogance and political smugness of the U.S.-flag merchant marine. . . . It provides clear evidence just how useless Marad's fair and reasonable rate regulation is. Even the 'Buy America' laws protect American taxpayers by allowing foreign products and services to be purchased if U.S. bids are 6% over the foreign bids," Sen. Grassley said.

TRIBUTE TO THE IDORA PARK HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to pay tribute to a group of hard-working individuals in my 17th Congressional District. I want to commend the Idora Park Historical Society for the job they have done and continue to do in cleaning up the old Idora Park grounds.

Recently, this fine collection of concerned citizens decided to fix up old Idora Park. This organization, which is not made up of wealthy citizens, invested time and sweat equity into the project of cleaning up the facility. Let me tell you something, that was no easy task.

Mr. Speaker, in 1984, a devastating fire ravaged its main roller coaster, destroying several

attractions. The park closed soon after that. For years, the neglected buildings deteriorated and the weeds began to grow. At one point in its history Idora Park was the best regional amusement park in northeast Ohio. The wild-cat roller coaster was listed as one of the ten best in the country. Many special events were held in the grand ballroom.

That all ended with the fire in 1984. But now the park is beginning to take on its old shine again. Working on weekends with their own tools, the Idora Park Historical Society is close to renovating the old ballroom. They plan to tackle the carousel and roller coasters next.

Mr. Speaker, part of their plan was to make the approved list for the National Register of Historical Places. This goal has recently been achieved. With this listing, the society can now apply for tax provisions and qualifications for grants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Idora Park Historical Society on this the first of many victories I know they will have on their road to restoring the historical heritage of Idora Park.

POTTER STEWART

HON. SAM COPPERSMITH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in support of Mr. PORTMAN's bill to designate a Federal courthouse in Cincinnati in honor of Justice Potter Stewart. Other speakers have described Justice Stewart's career, so I do not want to repeat those details. Instead, I want to focus on a few aspects of this man's life and urge my colleagues to join in honoring him.

Potter Stewart attended college and law school at Yale University, but after receiving his education, returned to his hometown to serve his community. He entered local politics, gaining election to and serving on the Cincinnati City Council, including vice mayor. He shares that honor with my friend and colleague, DAVID MANN, who now serves in this House but formerly served as mayor of Cincinnati. Justice Stewart served as a model of giving back to the community through public service at the lowest, but most important, level of government.

Justice Stewart then served for 4 years as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, followed by 23 years as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Throughout his career on the bench, he showed great intelligence, craftsmanship, and judicial temperament, gaining the well-deserved respect of his judicial colleagues, legal scholars, and lawyers.

I had the opportunity to meet Justice Stewart personally shortly after his retirement from the Supreme Court, when he came to Yale Law School for a speech and a dinner. I also knew Justice Stewart's brother, Zeph Stewart, who was a professor of classics at Harvard. Thus, in addition to Justice Stewart's professional accomplishments, I can speak, in a very small way, to his personal qualities as well.

During his life, Justice Stewart feared that a sentence from his concurring opinion in the

Jacobellis case would overpower all his other contributions and perhaps even appear on his tombstone. Indeed, this bill will allow visitors to DAVID MANN's district looking for the Federal courthouse to know it when they see it. Nonetheless, in light of his love for the law, his long and distinguished service as a judge, and his loyalty to his community, I urge my colleagues to support this honor for Justice Potter Stewart.

A TRIBUTE TO THE AIDS MEMORIAL QUILT ON DISPLAY IN SACRAMENTO

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Names Project AIDS Memorial Quilt, "A Personal Journey," which will be on display in Sacramento, CA, from September 24 through 26.

Acquired immune deficiency, or AIDS, has reached epidemic proportions in our country. To date, there have been more than 118,000 AIDS diagnosed cases in the United States, resulting in the tragic loss of 70,500 individuals. In California alone, over 60,000 cases of AIDS have been reported and more than 37,000 deaths, proving the urgent need for education in HIV awareness and prevention.

The AIDS quilt display is designed to build a powerful, positive, creative symbol of remembrance and hope, but more importantly, it acts as a teaching tool to educate young and old in a compassionate and caring way.

With this in mind, a pilot project aimed at young people has been added. "Kids Day at the Quilt" will tell the HIV/AIDS story through direct participation in the quilt display in conjunction with school site education programs.

"Kids Day at the Quilt" is being cosponsored by the Sacramento display host committee, the California Department of Education Capital Region Health Kids Center, and the California Department of Health Service Office of AIDS. It is supported by the California State PTA, religious leaders, and area organizations. Over 700 schools in 10 counties have been asked to participate.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to nationally acknowledge the important role and objectives of the Names Project and the AIDS Memorial Quilt have in educating people across the country about this deadly disease. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me today in commending the community of Sacramento for providing this opportunity to view the quilt and experience firsthand the profound expressions of love and loss from AIDS which this unique memorial bears.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT BRYLEWSKI, JR.

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my longtime and dear friend, Mr.

Albert Brylewski, Jr. Al will be leaving the Michigan Employment Security Commission after working there for over 30 years and establishing an outstanding record.

I know Al to be a man of great character and integrity. Al cares deeply about workers and their jobs. He has offered me wise advice over the years on these issues. Al has specifically counseled me on reforming the delivery system for workers' benefits. His knowledge and suggestions have been extremely valuable to me in my career.

Al helped countless Michigan workers during his service at the MESC. One of his most rewarding duties was the time he spent working on the Trade Readjustment Act. The Trade Readjustment Act was established to give benefits to workers who lost their jobs because of foreign competition. Al ran the office that managed the Trade Readjustment Act in Michigan. Among the many activities he supervised was the hiring of 500 temporary workers to assist with processing the many claims of displaced workers. Thousands of displaced workers were helped, thanks to Al's commitment and dedication.

Al has always maintained an open-door policy. In fact, during the difficult times for the automobile companies in Michigan, there was one occasion when the number of applicants for T.R.A. assistance was so large that their sheer number and force actually broke down his door. Al worked unceasingly to help all of those in need.

Al and I share a Polish heritage. We both attended St. Florian's Elementary School in Hamtramck, MI. I know Al is deeply devoted to his family. He and his wife Gerri have two wonderful children, Jim and Sharon. I am proud that his son Jim was an intern in my office in Washington, DC. Jim now has a fine position with the Detroit Tigers. Their lovely daughter, Sharon, is now a successful dental hygienist. The family has always been unusually close and caring and has been kind enough to welcome me often into their home.

Throughout my years in politics, the Brylewski family has been enormously helpful to me. They have always offered their support and shared their time and energy. I am grateful to Al and the family for their loyalty and friendship.

Al has been involved in many community activities. He is currently the vice chairman of the Macomb economic growth alliance. He is a past member of the board of directors for the Job Training Partnership Act. He is also the MESC's representative on the Director's Environmental Committee.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mr. Albert Brylewski, Jr. He is a valued member of our community and a true friend. I know Al will now turn his talents and convictions towards other worthwhile pursuits. I look forward to sharing more enjoyable times together.

COMPETITIVE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the introduction of President Clinton's health care reform plan, which proposes a system of managed competition and health care affordability. The President's plan provides a good framework for developing a bipartisan consensus in Congress on a state-of-art health care system that can be a model for other countries.

However, I believe there are a number of problems with the President's plan which must be addressed. Health reforms must improve people's access to quality care without destroying the current strengths of the system. For example, the majority of individuals with employer-provided benefits are satisfied with their current health insurance plans. And yet, the President proposes to terminate without exception all existing insurance plans causing severe disruption in people's coverage.

The President also proposes significant cuts in many people's access to health care. Medicare would be slashed by pushing senior citizens into HMO's where they won't be able to choose their own physical or hospital. Treatment and tests would be rationed, only generic drugs would be issued in most cases, any patients would be forced to see nurses instead of doctors in many instances.

Consumer choices are severely limited under the President's plan. People will only be allowed to obtain insurance through the one government-run regional monopoly in the form of one-size-fits-all benefits package. Individuals who wish to continue treatment by a doctor not in their plan, or to purchase private health insurance, will in effect have to pay twice for such coverage.

The President's plan also needs to be adjusted to lessen the blow to our fragile economy. The President proposes over \$700 billion in new Federal spending, to be administered by over 100 new Federal bureaucracies. This will be financed by \$105 billion in new taxes, in addition to the 10 percent payroll tax and a corporate assessment tax. Combined with the costly new coverage mandates imposed on small businesses, millions of people are expected to lose their jobs under the President's plan. We can not afford to lose more jobs in California.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the President's plan does not adequately address two primary reasons cited by President Clinton for health care reform: to control skyrocketing health care costs and to reduce the Federal deficit. Under the President's plan, total health care spending is projected to rise faster over the next several years than it would under the current system. In fact, without the new taxes and the assumed greater efficiency under a government-run system, the President's plan would add another \$65 billion to the national debt.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an alternative to the President's health

care reform plan. The Competitive Affordable Health Care Reform Act will make health care more affordable and accessible to all consumes without costly new mandates and without creating new, inefficient government bureaucracies. This legislation will encourage the development of flexible savings accounts [FSA], which individuals can use to purchase insurance coverage, pay health care expenses directly, or withdraw as taxable income at the end of the year. These accounts are fully portable, so that individuals do not have to worry about loss of coverage if they change jobs or become unemployed.

Currently, section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code permits employers to offer their employees a flexible spending account plan, whereby pre-tax funds may be set aside to cover the employee's health care and dependent care expenses. The employee decides at the beginning of each year how many dollars to set aside for direct medical expenses, and how many dollars to allocate towards insurance premiums, child care, and other fixed benefits. As written, the Code requires that any unused FSA funds at the end of each year must revert back to the employer, or be rebated to all employees as a group. Thus, moneys set aside for direct expenses which are not accrued by the end of the year are effectively lost to that employee.

Unfortunately, this mandated "Use It or Lose It" rule has the perverse effect of inducing employees, just before the end of each year, to overconsume otherwise unnecessary health care, so as not to lose their set-aside funds. Extra checkups, five pairs of glasses, ultra-deluxe tooth caps—employees have every incentive to try to find creative—though inefficient—ways of spending their extra FSA funds at the end of the year.

The Competitive Affordable Health Care Reform Act gives employees the option of withdrawing any excess funds as taxable income at the end of the year, or rolling the funds over into the following year's FSA fund. Employees are thereby given an incentive to conserve health care resources, and to increase their health care savings over time. Increased Federal revenues from taxes on the withdrawn FSA income could then be used to finance health care reform for the uninsured or under-insured.

The Competitive Affordable Health Care Reform Act also continues deductibility of current employer health care plans, provides a health care refundable tax credit for the uninsured, and allows self-employed individuals to deduct 100 percent of their health care expenses up to a maximum level. This plan builds on the current strengths of our system, while providing universal coverage and insurance portability.

To controls costs, the Competitive Affordable Health Care Reform Act initiates a number of legal and regulatory reforms. Attorneys fees and jury awards will be reduced, out-of-court settlements through alternative dispute resolution will be encouraged, and hospitals and insurers will be able to use standardized claims and reporting forms. The 800 plus State and Federal anti-competitive health care regulations and mandates will be replaced, and consumers will be given access to easy to understand health care costs forms and value

information to make their own coverage choices.

Mr. Speaker, giving our Government full control of 14 percent of our economy is not a cure for our health care system. People need more information, more choice, more freedom, and better incentives. I look forward to working with President Clinton to build a true market-oriented system, without turning the management of our health care over to another government bureaucracy.

THE HEALTH CARE MANDATE WILL CREATE LOSS OF JOBS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has a misconception about the effects of mandates in health care reform. Without a doubt, mandates requiring employers to pay for their workers' health insurance expenses will translate directly into higher labor cost. As a result, many employers will have to cut back on employee wages and hours in order to stay in business. The hardest hit by health care mandates will be the low-wage jobs that will be eliminated. In his article, "The Price of a Health Care Mandate," Carlos Bonilla outlines the effects of health care mandates on businesses. I submit Mr. Bonilla's article, which appeared in the August 20, 1993, issue of the Wall Street Journal, to my colleagues' attention and urge them to keep it in mind as we consider these important matters in the future.

THE PRICE OF A HEALTH CARE MANDATE (By Carlos Bonilla)

Speaking to the American Hospital Association earlier this month, Hillary Rodham Clinton questioned why companies that do not provide health insurance to their employees should be allowed to "get what amounts to a free ride." Mrs. Clinton—who headed the White House Health Care Task Force—demonstrated with this comment that she had no idea at all how health care is actually financed in America.

Mrs. Clinton has confused employment-based health insurance with employer-paid health insurance. In fact, there is no such thing as employer-paid health insurance. All workers who receive health insurance through their place of employment pay for that coverage, either directly through deduction from their paychecks or indirectly through lower wages. The absence of a health insurance deduction on a pay stub by no means makes this an expense paid for by employers.

Because of this confusion, Mrs. Clinton has failed to ask the question that belongs at the core of any discussion of a health care mandate: What will be the impact on employment of a federally mandated wage increase of approximately \$5,000—the employer's share of the cost of providing health insurance coverage (for a worker with dependents) that the administration is proposing?

THE O'NEILLS' ESTIMATE

June O'Neill and David O'Neill, both professors of economics at Baruch College, City University of New York, have the answer in a study prepared for the Employment Poli-

cies Institute. Recognizing that a mandate requiring employers to pay their workers' health insurance expenses translates directly into an increase in labor costs, the O'Neills estimate that this increased cost will lead to the loss of 3.1 million jobs.

These lost jobs will not be scattered randomly across the economy. They will be heavily concentrated in just seven industries. More than 75% of the lost jobs will be in industries such as restaurants, other sectors of retail trade and construction.

Although seemingly unrelated, these seven industries share one common trait: They are all employers of large numbers of low-wage, and therefore more often uninsured, workers. The disproportionately large concentration of job losses in these industries relative to the economy as a whole reflects the concentration of low-wage workers in these sectors. Labor costs would rise by more than 19% in the restaurant industry with a health care mandate. Costs would rise by more than 33% in private household services and by more than 15% in agriculture.

An external increase in labor costs, such as the Clinton mandate would impose, is not a major issue in higher-wage industries. In these industries, any costs that arise will be quickly shifted back onto payrolls—not necessarily through an immediate reduction in wages (although some of that will no doubt happen) but more often from an erosion in wage increases until the compensation package is brought back into line.

This cannot happen as readily for low-wage jobs. Cutting a planned 5% wage increase on a \$40,000 job by half shifts \$1,000 of the mandate onto a worker's wages in just one year. In this example, a complete shifting of the mandate's cost can be accomplished in five years—an employer cost has been converted into an employee cost. But it would take 15 years of such shifting to accomplish the same for a minimum-wage job. Moreover, faster shifting through an immediate reduction in the earnings of low-wage workers is blocked by the minimum wage. And even without the minimum-wage constraint, a serious institutional constraint comes into play: Who would work at a \$10,000-a-year job only to see cash wages halved to \$5,000? A Blue Cross card won't pay the rent.

In low-wage jobs, the only means to reduce labor costs is to reduce labor. And when labor costs are a high percentage of total operating costs, as they are in the most affected industries, the effect will be large job losses. Job losses are not related to the size of the firm. Although the administration has spoken often of its intention to accommodate small business, business size is a crude determinant: Many "small" businesses, such as law firms and venture capital firms, are much better suited to absorb higher labor costs than some of the largest companies providing mostly entry-level jobs.

Clearly, a mandate on a restaurant with 100 employees—many of them part-timers working for relatively low wages—has a very different impact than a mandate on General Motors, yet both are likely to be viewed as capable of absorbing the new mandate. As a consequence, low-wage workers, the portion of the work force that a mandate aims to help, will suffer the bulk of the job losses from a mandate.

President Clinton has vowed to the American people to "end welfare as we know it." His prescription appears to rely heavily on a familiar remedy: Two years of education and training for adult recipients, after which they would be expected to find a job and cease reliance on government assistance.

The president's premise, at least according to the campaign rhetoric, is to help public assistance recipients find not only a job but a "good" job. The question before us is whether the president's definition of a good job—one that appears to include a generous mandated health benefits package—effectively eliminates the prospects of obtaining any job at all.

Many of the people seeking to move from welfare to work are qualified only for lower-wage positions. They can move up the ladder only if they are given the opportunity to work. But a mandate is insensitive to the labor market. It would vastly increase the cost of hiring these workers, thereby becoming a latent disincentive to hire the typical single mother on welfare.

These individuals cannot pay for benefits by trading wages. They pay with their jobs.

President Clinton seems to have taken note of some of the problems a mandate would impose on low-wage industries. Speaking to the nation's governors Monday, the president stated that a mandate had the potential to place low-wage industries "in deep trouble." The president went on to offer the hope that a mandate's costs would be capped at about 7% of payroll.

Caps on the mandate's cost, if they are actually realized, will reduce the job loss estimates presented here. But it is still premature to bank on caps, at least at the level discussed by the president. Too much of the financing for health reform hinges on predicted savings from the delivery of health care, savings that have proved elusive to more than one president. Moreover, the president's hope to cap the mandate cost at 7% may be hopelessly unrealistic. Recent estimates have placed the cost of health care reform at between 10% and 12% of payroll. A cap at 7% would leave the president many billions of dollars short of the revenue he needs for reform just months after passing a large tax increase. Caps on mandates may very well experience the same fate as the middle-class tax cut.

SAME MISTAKEN ASSUMPTION

Yet job losses will continue, even with the president's admission that accommodation needs to be made for the needs of low-wage workers and industries. These losses will arise because the president is proceeding on the same mistaken assumption as Mrs. Clinton: that is employers who pay for benefits out of profits instead of workers out of wages.

The nation's economists agree. This spring the Survey Center at the University of New Hampshire polled members of the American Economics Association regarding their views on health care mandates. (The association is the leading professional body for American economists.) Eighty percent of economists responded that a health-care mandate would result in lost jobs for lower wage workers. The O'Neills have quantified that loss.

In his speech to the nation's governors, the president warned the public to stop believing that health care is "paid for by the tooth fairy." He would do well to heed his own advice.

HONORING DR. PETER CORONA

HON. WILLIAM P. BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Peter Corona has contributed 42 years of

service to the public school system of California and has impacted the lives of thousands of individuals. He has served as a teacher, coach, vice principal, principal, business manager, assistant superintendent, superintendent, community college teacher and State university teacher.

Corona served as a superintendent of schools for a span of 34 years and has been an educational leader in school districts ranging in size from a small hamlet of 150 students to a district covering seven cities with 33,000 students.

Dr. Corona's breadth of experience includes schools in rural, suburban and inner-city urban America, working with various ethnic groups including large numbers of African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, Native Americans, and Caucasians.

He has achieved a long and distinguished list of awards for community service accomplishments and leadership in professional organizations. His awards include: Bringing the All American City Award to the City of Montebello; being selected Man of the Year for Emeryville; America's Superintendent of the Month by the American Association of School Administrators; One Thousand Notable Americans; Who's Who in America; and Who's Who in the World.

Peter Corona lectured internationally and has been published widely. His accomplishments have been documented with considerable positive recognition. His administrative leadership style has been discussed in public administration and educational courses in a number of college and universities in California.

Corona has established a reputation for having left each of his school districts in better financial shape. He exemplifies the type of educational leadership America needs today.

As a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I commend Dr. Peter Corona for his varied deeds of leadership, goodwill, and for the mark he has made on the educational community and the many lives he has touched. It is hoped that his spirit of commitment will continue to be emulated by those who follow in his footsteps.

THE TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY ACT OF 1993

HON. JIM SLATTERY
OF KANSAS

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1993

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined today by my colleagues, Representative GREENWOOD of Pennsylvania, Representative PALLONE of New Jersey, and Representative QUILLEN of Tennessee in reintroducing the Traumatic Brain Injury Act of 1993.

We have each sponsored legislative bills regarding this issue earlier this year and have come together today to jointly place our bipartisan efforts behind one single initiative which we hope will be considered by Congress and enacted into law.

Every 15 seconds someone in the United States sustains a head injury and 98 percent of these individuals will survive the accident. According to the National Head Injury Foundation [NHIF], a survivor of a severe brain injury typically faces 5-10 years of intensive medical and related services at an annual cost of approximately \$86,000. Estimated lifetime costs to care for a traumatic brain injury survivor can exceed \$4,000,000.

Half of all traumatic brain injuries are caused by car accidents. Among children, abuse accounts for 64 percent of all infant head injuries, while 50,000 head injuries occur each year as a result of bicycle accidents. This act will encourage development of national standards for bicycle helmets.

The legislation we are introducing today will also help raise public awareness of the serious risks and tragic consequences of head injuries and will designate a Federal agency to oversee and promote projects to prevent traumatic brain injury and to assist in rehabilitation efforts across the Nation.

This legislation also will assist States in creating advisory boards to coordinate citizen participation in community traumatic brain injury programs and will create a registry to advance epidemiologic research efforts across the Nation.

Additionally, our legislation calls for major studies to be conducted on the causes and prevention of brain injury. More importantly, this legislation emphasizes the discovery and use of unique ways to prevent injury and heighten individual responsibility. It is important that we find effective ways to encourage people to act responsibly, without establishing the adversarial relationships that are created by government mandates like helmet laws.

Currently there are no national standards for motorcycle helmets, and in some instances it has been documented that a poorly designed helmet can be more dangerous in an accident than no helmet at all. Our legislation encourages Federal, State, and local health agencies to take a more comprehensive approach to preventing traumatic brain injury by looking deeper into the root causes of these injuries.

I am pleased that the State of Kansas was the first State to submit and receive approval on a Title XIX Home and Community-Based Services Waiver to provide services to people with head injuries in their own home. I am hopeful that our legislation will encourage other States to develop home care programs for traumatic brain injury survivors and will create a nationwide network for survivors and their families and friends.

The Traumatic Brain Injury Act, which emphasizes prevention and treatment options, will help these individuals and their families cope with the debilitating and lifelong consequences of these tragic accidents.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and I look forward to the speedy enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Act of 1993.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 23, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 24

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of F. William McCalpin, of Missouri, John G. Brooks, of Massachusetts, Edna Fairbanks Williams, of Vermont, LaVeada Morgan Battle, of Alabama, Ernestine P. Watlington, of Pennsylvania, Maria Luisa Mercado, of Texas, Thomas F. Smegal, Jr., of California, Nancy Hardin Rogers, of Ohio, Douglas S. Eakeley, of New Jersey, John T. Broderick, Jr., of New Hampshire, and Hulett Hall Askew, of Georgia, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 27

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of Diane Blair, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

SR-253

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Carol J. Lancaster, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development, Margaret V. W. Carpenter, of California, to be Assistant Administrator for Asia of the Agency for International Development, and John Roggen Schmidt, of Illinois, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as the Chief U.S. Negotiator of the Uruguay Round.

SD-419

SEPTEMBER 28

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

SR-332

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for programs of the Airport Improvement Act.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 491, to provide health care for every American and to control the cost of the health care system.

SR-325

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings with the Committee on Finance on S. 491, to provide health care for every American and to control the cost of the health care system.

SR-325

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Alan John Blinken, of New York, to be Ambassador to Belgium, Parker W. Borg, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland, Richard A. Boucher, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, Swannee Grace Hunt, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, Thomas A. Loftus, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to Norway, William Dale Montgomery, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria, and Thomas Michael Tolliver Niles, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to Greece.

SD-419

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1361, to establish a national framework for the development of School-to-Work Opportunities systems in all States.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 29

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on Robert W. Perciasepe, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water, Lynn R. Goldman, of California, to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Elliott P. Laws, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, and Jean C. Nelson, of Tennessee, to be General Counsel, all for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Marian C. Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, U.S. Information Agency, Tobi Trister Gati, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, and Daniel L. Spiegel, of Virginia, to be U.S. Representative to the European Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

SD-419

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on certain provisions of S. 491, to provide health care for every

American and to control the cost of the health care system.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Roger R. Gamble, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname, Peter F. Romero, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, and William Lacy Swing, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti.

SD-419

SEPTEMBER 30

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Edward Joseph Perkins, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Australia, and Richard W. Teare, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to Solomon Islands and to the Republic of Vanuatu.

SD-419

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Carol Bellamy, of New York, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

S-116, Capitol

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

SR-332